

From the INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

See form PCT//SA/220 WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43b/s.1) Date of mailing (caytronthyteat) see form PCT//SA/210 (second sheet) POR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below See paragraph 2 below International application No. Portniss (Asymonthyteat) (Pct (Asymonthyteat)) (Priority date (daytronthyteat)) (Priority date) (P	INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43 bis.1) Date of mailing (day/monthylear) see form PCT/ISA210 (second sheet) Applicant's or agent's file reference see form PCT/ISA2210 (second sheet) FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below International application No. PCTJS2005/006627 International application (IPC) or both national classification and IPC C07D491/04, A61K31/436, A61P29/00 Applicant LIGAND PHARMACEUTICALS INCORPORATED 1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items: Box No. II Priority Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability Box No. VI Lack of unity of invention Box No. VI Cartain decreate and explanations supporting such statement Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international preliminary Examining Authority (*IPEA*). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66. bix(bix) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be	То:			PCT				
International application No. International filing date (day/month/year) 25.02.2004 24.02.2005 25.02.2004 25.0	International application No. International filing date (day/month/year) 25.02.2004 25.02.			Date of mailing (day/month/year) see	PCT Rule 43bis.1) e form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)				
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC C07D491/04, A61K31436, A61P2900 Applicant LIGAND PHARMACEUTICALS INCORPORATED 1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items: Box No. I Basis of the opinion Priority Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention Box No. V Lack of unity of invention Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement Box No. VI Certain documents cited Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application Sox No. VIII Certain observations on the international application FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Asserting Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISAA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISAA/220.	PCT/US2005/006627 24.02.2005 International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC C07049104, A61K31/436, A61P29/00 Applicant LIGAND PHARMACEUTICALS INCORPORATED 1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items: Box No. I Basis of the opinion Box No. II Priority Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention Box No. IV Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement Box No. VI Certain documents cited Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Breau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.								
Applicant LIGAND PHARMACEUTICALS INCORPORATED 1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items: Box No. Basis of the opinion Box No. Priority Box No. Priority Box No. Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability Box No. Lack of unity of invention Box No. Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement Box No. VI Certain documents cited Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application 2. FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.	Applicant LIGAND PHARMACEUTICALS INCORPORATED 1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items: Box No. Basis of the opinion		-	day/month/year)					
1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items: Box No. Basis of the opinion	1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items: Box No. Basis of the opinion			and IPC					
 ☑ Box No. I Basis of the opinion ☐ Box No. II Priority ☑ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability ☑ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention ☑ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application 2. FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220. 	 Box No. I Basis of the opinion Box No. II Priority Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement Box No. VI Certain documents cited Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIIII Certain observations on the international application FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notifed the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. 		CORPORATED						
		1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items: □ Box No. I Basis of the opinion □ Box No. II Priority □ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability □ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention □ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement □ Box No. VI Certain documents cited □ Box No. VII Certain observations on the international application □ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application □ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application 2. FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.							

Name and mailing address of the ISA:

Authorized Officer

<u>a</u>))

European Patent Office - P.B. 5818 Patentlaan 2 NL-2280 HV Rijswijk - Pays Bas Tel. +31 70 340 - 2040 Tx; 31 651 epo nl Fax: +31 70 340 - 3016

Diederen, J

Telephone No. +31 70 340-1097





LAP C'd PCT/PTO 17 AUG 2006

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/US2005/006627

	Box N	o. I Basis of the opinion					
1.	With r the lai	Vith regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.					
	la	his opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following nguage , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).					
2.	With r	egard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and sary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:					
	a. typ	e of material:					
		a sequence listing					
		table(s) related to the sequence listing					
	b. for	nat of material:					
		in written format					
		in computer readable form					
	c. tim	e of filing/furnishing:					
	. 🗅	contained in the international application as filed.					
	D	filed together with the international application in computer readable form.					
		furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.					
3.	h	n addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto as been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional opies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as ppropriate, were furnished.					
4.	Addit	onal comments:					





WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/US2005/006627

	Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability				
The obv	questions whether the claimed ious), or to be industrially applica	inven able h	tion appears to be novel, to involve an inventive step (to be non nave not been examined in respect of:		
	the entire international application	on,			
⊠	claims Nos. 122-125				
bec	ause:				
⊠	the said international application, or the said claims Nos. 122-125 (with respect to industrial application) relate to the following subject matter which does not require an international preliminary examination (specify):				
	see separate sheet		•		
	the description, claims or drawin unclear that no meaningful opin	ngs <i>(</i> iion c	indicate particular elements below) or said claims Nos. are so ould be formed (specify):		
	the claims, or said claims Nos. are so inadequately supported by the description that no meaningful opinion could be formed.				
	no international search report has been established for the whole application or for said claims Nos.				
	the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing does not comply with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions in that:				
	the written form		has not been furnished		
			does not comply with the standard		
	the computer readable form		has not been furnished		
			does not comply with the standard		
	the tables related to the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing, if in computer readable form only, do not comply with the technical requirements provided for in Annex C-bis of the Administrative Instructions.				
	See separate sheet for further details				





WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/US2005/006627

	Box	No. IV	Lack of unity of i	nvention		
1.		n resp	onse to the invitation	(Form P	CT/ISA/206) to pay additional fees, the applicant has:
			paid additional fees.			·
			paid additional fees	under pro	otest.	
			not paid additional f	ees.		
2.	⊠ ·	This Ai	uthority found that the olicant to pay addition	e requirer nal fees.	nent of uni	ty of invention is not complied with and chose not to invite
3.	This	Autho	rity considers that the	e requiren	nent of unit	y of invention in accordance with Rule 13.1, 13.2 and 13.3 is
		 0: -	مادن			
		omplie				
	⊠ n	ot com	plied with for the folk	owing rea	sons:	
		see se	parate sheet			
4.	Cons	sequer	ntly, this report has be	een estab	olished in re	espect of the following parts of the international application:
	⊠a	li parts	*			
	□ tì	ne part	s relating to claims N	los.		
_	Box indu	No. V strial	Reasoned staten applicability; citation	nent und ons and e	er Rule 43 explanation	bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or ns supporting such statement
1	. State	ement				
	Nove	elty (N)	Yes:	Claims	41-45, 84-86, 88-98, 100, 104,105, 121
			•	No:	Claims	1-40, 46-83, 87, 99, 101-103, 106-120, 122-137
	Inve	ntive s	tep (IS)	Yes:	Claims	
				No:	Claims	1-137
	İndu	strial a	applicability (IA)	Yes: No:	Claims Claims	1-121,126-137

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet





WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (SEPARATE SHEET)

International application No.

PCT/US2005/006627

Re Item III.

Claims 122-125 relate to subject-matter considered by this Authority to be covered by the provisions of Rule 67.1(iv) PCT. Consequently, no opinion will be formulated with respect to the industrial applicability of the subject-matter of these claims (Article 34(4)(a)(I) PCT).

Re Item IV.

This Authority considers that there are two inventions covered by the claims indicated as follows:

I: Claims 1-83 (in part), 99,100,106,107-137 (in part) directed to compounds of Formula (I) wherein R1 is an aromatic 6-membered ring (phenyl, naphthyl, pyridine) II: Claims 84-98, 101-105, 107-137 (in part) directed to compounds of Formula (I) wherein R1 is an unsaturated 5-membered heterocyclic ring (thienyl or oxalyl groups)

Reference is made to the following document:

D1: WO 02/02565 A (ABBOTT LABORATORIES; LIGAND PHARMACEUTICALS INCORPORATED) 10 January 2002 (2002-01-10)

Document D1 discloses on page 36 and 37, compounds which are novelty destroying for claim 1 of the present application. These compounds are used for the same purpose as the compounds of the present application, i.e. modulation of glucocorticoid receptors. The compounds have either a pyridine or a phenyl groups corresponding with the R1 in the present application.

The only technical feature in claim 1 of the present application which can act as the special technical feature, as laid down on Rule 13.2 PCT, is the general Markush Formula (I). As this feature is not novel, and there are no other technical features which can act as special technical feature, there is a lack of Unity of Invention, according to Rule 13.2 PCT. The novelty destroying compounds as disclosed in D1 have in common that they all bear 6-membered aromatic rings as substituent like the corresponding R1 group of the present compounds. The application is therefore split into two parts, one in which R1 is an aromatic 6-membered ring and one wherein R1 is an unsaturated 5-membered heterocyclic ring.





WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (SEPARATE SHEET)

International application No.

PCT/US2005/006627

Re Item V.

1. Novelty (Article 33(2) PCT)

The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of claims 1-40, 46-83,87,99,101-103,106-120,122-137 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT.

Document D1 discloses on page 36 lines 20-23, 28-37 and page 37 line 1 several compounds which are used as modulators for glucocorticoid receptors. This disclosure is novelty destroying for claims 1-40, 46-83,87,99,101-103,106-120,122-137 of the present application.

2. Inventive Step (Article 33(3) PCT)

The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of claims 1-137 does not involve an inventive step in the sense of Article 33(3) PCT.

In as far as the subject-matter of the present application is novel, it does not contain any additional features in the claims which, in combination with the claims they depend on, render the subject-matter inventive over the prior art.